



PEARNE & GORDON
LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
PATENTS • TRADEMARKS • COPYRIGHTS
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LITIGATION

John P. Murtaugh
jmurtaugh@pearne.com

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re: U.S. Patent No. 7,731,027
Issued: June 8, 2010
Inventors: Jan Peter Kruit
Atty Docket No.: VOB-38838

Sir:

A Certificate of Correction under 35 U.S.C. 254 is hereby requested to correct Patent Office printing errors in the above-identified patent. Enclosed herewith is a proposed Certificate of Correction (Form No. PTO/SB/44) and documentation in support of the proposed corrections for consideration. Please note that Claim 8 in the attached Amendment corresponds to Claim 11 as printed in the patent.

It is requested that the Certificate of Correction be completed and mailed at an early date to the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By John P. Murtaugh
John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, OH 44114-3108
Phone: 216-579-1700

Date: August 6, 2010

Enclosures: Form PTO/SB/44

CHARLES B. GORDON
THOMAS P. SCHILLER
DAVID B. DEIOMA
JOSEPH J. CORSO
HOWARD G. SHIMOLA
JEFFREY J. SOPKO
JOHN P. MURTAUGH
JAMES M. MOORE
MICHAEL W. GARVEY
RICHARD A. SHARPE
RONALD M. KACHMARIK
PAUL A. SERBINOWSKI
STEPHEN S. WENTSLE
AARON A. FISHMAN
ROBERT F. BODI
UNA L. LAURICIA
STEVEN J. SOLOMON

DEBORAH L. CORPUS
DONALD J. FIRCA, JR.
BRAD C. SPENCER, P.E.
BRYAN M. GALLO
SEONGYOUNG KANG
NOBUHIKO SUKENAGA
J. GREGORY CHRISMAN
IVAN R. GOLDBERG
GREGORY M. YORK, PH.D.
MARTIN M. KILBANE

OF COUNSEL
LOWELL L. HEINKE
THADDEUS A. ZALENSKI

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION**Page 2 of 2

PATENT NO. : 7,731,027
APPLICATION NO.: 10/551,744
ISSUE DATE : JUNE 8, 2010
INVENTOR(S) : JAN PETER KRUIT

It is certified that an error appears or errors appear in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent is hereby corrected as shown below:

In column 11, line 12, in Claim 18, please delete "claim 8",
and insert therefor --claim 11--.

MAILING ADDRESS OF SENDER (Please do not use customer number below):

JOHN P. MURTAUGH/PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET, SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND OH 44114-3108

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.322, 1.323, and 1.324. This information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.0 hour to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Attention Certificate of Corrections Branch, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Jan Peter Kruit
Application No.: 10/551,744
Filed: June 5, 2006
Title: PACKAGE AND BLANK AND APPARATUS FOR FORMING SUCH PACKAGE

Conf. No.: 4272
Art Unit: 3728
Examiner: Jacob K. Ackun

Docket No.: VOB-38838

AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Amendment and Request for Continued Examination (RCE) are filed in response to the Final Office action mailed on July 2, 2009 having a three month response date of October 2, 2009. Applicant accordingly requests and petitions for a three month extension of time, up to and including January 2, 2010, within which to respond. Please charge the \$1110 extension of time fee and the \$810 RCE fee to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. VOB-38838. Please amend the above-identified application as follows.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application.

1. (Currently Amended) A package for containers folded from a blank, provided with:
 - a substantially closed bottom panel;
 - two side panels, upstanding from the bottom panel, on opposite sides thereof;
 - two upper flaps, each extending from an opposite one of the side panels, folded in an inward direction from the side panels to at least partially overlap each other over containers arranged on the bottom panel and collectively form an upper panel;
 - end wall flaps extending on both sides of each side panel while confining the containers; and
 - top flaps extending from the upper edges of the end wall flaps facing away from the bottom panel, below or between the upper flaps;
 - wherein at least two of the top flaps and/or the upper flaps are attached to each other.
2. (Original) A package according to claim 1, wherein the end wall flaps are mutually connected on both ends of the bottom panel by edge flaps extending from the bottom panel.
3. (Original) A package according to claim 2, wherein the edge flaps are connected to the end wall flaps by folding flaps, such that the package can be folded from a planar blank.
4. (Previously Presented) A package according to claim 1, wherein the end wall flaps overlap, at least partly.
5. (Previously Presented) A package according to claim 1, wherein a first upper flap rests on the top side of the containers, while on the upper side of the first upper flap at least one glue trace is provided which extends along at least one edge of said first upper flap, the top flaps and a second upper flap being fastened to the first upper flap with the aid of said at least one glue trace.
6. (Previously Presented) A package according to claim 5, wherein said at least one glue trace is built up from individual glue surfaces.
7. (Previously Presented) A package according to claim 1, wherein, in both upper flaps, recesses are provided overlapping each other at least partly, while in the recesses in the overlying upper flap folding lips are provided which are or can be pressed through the underlying recesses, such that said folding lips connect the two upper flaps and engagement openings are provided for lifting the package.
8. (Currently Amended) A blank for a package for containers, provided with:

- a substantially closed bottom panel;
- two side panels connected to the bottom panel via first fold lines extending parallel to each other;
- first and second upper flaps each connected to an opposite one of the side panels via fifth fold lines extending substantially parallel to the first fold lines to be folded in inward directions about the fifth fold lines to collectively form an upper panel, wherein the first and second upper flaps include dimensions suitable to allow the first and second upper flaps to at least partially overlap each other over a region of the bottom panel that is to support the containers when placed within the package;
- end wall flaps connected to the side panels via third fold lines extending substantially at right angles to the first and fifth fold lines; and
- top flaps connected to the end wall flaps via sixth fold lines extending approximately in line with, at least substantially parallel to the fifth fold lines.

9. (Original) A blank according to claim 8, further provided with edge flaps connected to the bottom panel via second fold lines extending approximately in line with, at least parallel to the third fold lines.

10. (Original) A blank according to claim 9, wherein each edge flap, via an eighth fold line, is connected to a substantially triangular folding flap, which folding flap is connected to an end wall flap via a seventh fold line.

11. (Previously Presented) A blank according to claim 8, wherein the bottom panel has a width viewed in the longitudinal direction of the second fold lines and a length viewed in the longitudinal direction of the first and fifth fold lines, while the joint length of the end wall flaps, measured approximately at right angles to the third fold lines, is approximately equal to or slightly greater than the width of the bottom panel.

12. (Previously Presented) A blank according to claim 8, wherein the side panels have a height, measured between the respective first and fifth fold lines, while the end wall flaps have a height which is substantially equal to the height of said side panels.

13. (Previously Presented) A blank according to claim 8, wherein the top flaps have a length, measured approximately at right angles to the sixth fold lines, which is approximately equal to or slightly smaller than the length of the upper flaps, measured approximately at right angles to the fifth fold lines.

14. (Previously Presented) A blank according to claim 8, wherein the upper flaps have a length such that, with the package set up, they overlap while in each of the upper flaps at least two recesses are provided, while in the recesses of at least one upper flap folding lips are provided, connected to the respective upper flap via a fold line, which folding lips widen somewhat from said fold line, while the

greatest width of the folding lips is greater than the greatest width of the recesses in the other upper flap, measured approximately parallel to said fold line.

15. (Previously Presented) A package comprising a blank according to claim 8, wherein on the bottom panel at least one row of containers is arranged, which containers are arranged against each other and extend along the longitudinal edges of the bottom panel, said blank having been arranged as follows:

- the side panels folded on opposite sides against the containers;
- the end wall flaps folded on opposite ends against the containers;
- the first upper flap, the top flaps and the second upper flap folded over the top side of the containers;
- the top flaps received between the containers and the first upper flap and/ or between the first and/or the second upper flap; and
- wherein the first and second upper flap are connected to each other and/or to the top flaps.

16. (Previously Presented) A package comprising a blank according to claim 9, wherein on the bottom panel at least one row of containers is arranged, which containers are arranged against each other and extend along the longitudinal edges of the bottom panel, said blank having been arranged as follows:

- the side panels folded on opposite sides against the containers;
- the edge flaps folded on opposite ends against the containers;
- the end wall flaps folded on opposite ends against the containers and/or the edge flaps;
- the first upper flap, the top flaps and the second upper flap folded over the top side of the containers;
- the top flaps received between the containers and the first upper flap and/or between the first and/or second upper flap; and
- wherein the first and second upper flap are connected to each other and/ or the top flaps.

17-21. (Cancelled)

22. (Previously Presented) A package according to claim 5, wherein said at least one glue trace extends along at least three edges of said first upper flap.

23. (Previously Presented) A package according to claim 6, wherein said individual glue surfaces are drops.

24. (Currently amended) A package according to claim 1, ~~wherein said~~ further comprising containers disposed within the package, wherein the containers are bottles or cans.

25. (New) A package for containers folded from a blank, the package comprising:

- a substantially closed bottom panel;
- two side panels, upstanding from the bottom panel, on opposite sides thereof;
- two upper flaps, each extending from an opposite one of the side panels and folded in an inward direction from the side panels to at least partially overlap each other over containers arranged on the bottom panel;
- an aperture formed in each of the two upper flaps, wherein the aperture provided to one of the two upper flaps is aligned with the aperture provided to another of the two upper flaps to define a carry opening that extends through both of the two upper flaps and leads into an interior of the package;
- end wall flaps extending on both sides of each side panel while confining the containers; and
- top flaps extending from the upper edges of the end wall flaps facing away from the bottom panel, below or between the upper flaps;
- wherein at least the top flaps and/or the upper flaps are attached to each other.

26. (New) A blank for a package for containers, provided with:

- a substantially closed bottom panel;
- two side panels connected to the bottom panel via first fold lines extending parallel to each other;
- first and second upper flaps each connected to an opposite side of the side panels via fifth fold lines extending substantially parallel to the first fold lines to be folded in inward directions about the fifth fold lines to collectively form an upper panel above that is substantially parallel with the bottom panel, wherein the first and second upper flaps include dimensions suitable to allow the first and second upper flaps to at least partially overlap each other over a region of the bottom panel that is to support the containers when placed within the package;
- an aperture formed in each of the first and second upper flaps, wherein the aperture provided to the first upper flap is aligned with the aperture provided to the second upper flap when the first and second upper flaps are folded about the fifth fold lines in the inward directions to define a carry opening that extends through both of the first and second upper flaps and leads into an interior of the package;
- end wall flaps connected to the side panels via third fold lines extending substantially at right angles to the first and fifth fold lines; and
- top flaps connected to the end wall flaps via sixth fold lines extending approximately in line with, at least substantially parallel to the fifth fold lines.

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the application in view of the comments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

Claim 24 was rejected as being indefinite. However, claim 24 has been amended to positively recite the containers in combination with the claimed package, thus rendering that claim definite under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e)/103(a)

Claims 1-16 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of McElwee (US 2,659,524) (hereinafter “McElwee”) or Sutherland (US 5,669,500) (hereinafter “Sutherland”). However, Applicant respectfully submits that both McElwee and Sutherland, alone or in combination with each other, fail to teach every feature of the invention as claimed.

Specifically with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that both McElwee and Sutherland fail to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable “two upper flaps, each extending from an opposite one of the side panels, folded in an inward direction from the side panels to at least partially overlap each other” as claimed. As specified by claim 1, these two upper flaps collectively form an upper panel that is substantially parallel to the bottom panel above the containers. The overlapping upper flaps forming the upper panel is advantageous because it allows the package to be formed from a thin starting blank to minimize the amount of material and, accordingly, the overall cost required to form the package. It is possible that the thickness of the starting blank is not sufficient, by itself, to support the weight of the package. But since the two upper flaps overlap to double the thickness of the resulting upper panel, the upper panel is sufficiently strong to support the weight of the package without requiring a heavy gauge blank to be used, thereby minimizing the amount of material and cost to form the package. It is submitted that the inventor has recognized that the upper panel is the “bottleneck” with respect to the strength of the package. The side panels and even the bottom panel can be thin, as long as the upper panel from which the package is to be carried is sufficiently strong. In the present invention this has been inventively solved by doubling (at least) the thickness in that part, and the interconnection of at least two of said flaps forming the upper panel from which the package is to be carried.

According to McElwee, “[o]ne of the side wall members (2) is provided at its free outer edge with a top forming flap member 7 having lines of cut-scores or perforations 8, 8, 8 joining a folding score 9 defining the top edge of the side wall a member 2 and providing a rupturable panel or flap to form an access opening to the interior of the finished carton...” Col. 2, lines 44-51. Thus, McElwee teaches a

single upper flap extending from one of the side wall members. There is no other upper flap that overlaps the single upper flap in McElwee. And providing a second, overlapping upper flap to the carton in McElwee would also not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because doing so would render the carton in McElwee unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, contrary to M.P.E.P. §2143,01(V). A second, overlapping upper flap provided to the carton in McElwee would obstruct the access opening provided to the single upper flap in McElwee that can be opened by users of the “rupturable pane or flap.” If the access opening is obstructed users would not be able to extract the contents of the McElwee carton through the access opening.

Likewise, Sutherland also fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable the “two upper flaps, each extending from an opposite one of the side panels, folded in an inward direction from the side panels to at least partially overlap each other” recited in amended claim 1. A single, “top panel 14” is connected to a “glue flap 50” by “fold line 48.” Once again, the single top panel 14 of Sutherland extends entirely across the top of the package disclosed therein, and the glue flap 50 is glued to the interior-facing side of the opposite side panel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Sutherland also fails to teach overlapping upper flaps.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to include a second, overlapping upper flap as claimed to the teachings of Sutherland for reasons similar to those for McElwee. In Sutherland the (one, single) upper flap folds over the upper array of bottles and has a glue flap attached to it, which is glued to the upper part of the side panel. Sutherland lacks two upper flaps, both of which are folded over the bottles, similar to McElwee. In this field it would be highly unlikely one of ordinary skill would add flaps and other parts to existing packaging, unless they would have very special reasons, which are neither given in nor suggested by either McElwee or Sutherland.

In the present invention, for example, two upper flaps and four top flaps can be folded over the bottles, where after the upper flaps and/or the top flaps are glued to each other (at least to one or two of the other flaps). This results in a multi layer top panel which therefore is reinforced, allowing the material from which the blank is made to be relatively thin. This results in a serious reduction in weight, especially considered with respect to containers full of such packages. The top panel will be the panel from which the package is carried, so this has to be among the strongest. Reduction of weight of the blank also reduces cost for the blank, makes folding easier, may reduce glue cost etc.

In McElwee the carrying strength does not play a role with respect to the top panel since here the carrying flap (with openings) is a direct extension of the side panel, so all carrying forces will substantially be led through to said side panel. In McElwee this will result in the package tilting about the fold line 14. In the present invention carrying openings can be provided in the top panel, so as to allow the package to be carried in a “straight up” fashion. Moreover, over McElwee this has the advantage that a closer packing of packages is possible, since the top panel will be flat, allowing a further package to be stacked upon it.

In Sutherland a carrying strap 40 (see fig. 12) is added to the package after it has been made, by gluing a strap with both ends to opposite side panels of the package. As can be seen in fig. 11 and 12 of Sutherland, the strap 40 is glued to the side panels between short score lines, allowing part of the side and top panel to be bent out of shape when lifting the strap. This solution is disadvantageous for several reasons. First, it adds material to the package. Secondly, it necessitates an extra step in the process. Thirdly, this (especially the score lines) reduces the strength of the package, whereas the full weight of the package will have to be transferred to the strap over two very small material areas (the cross section of the strap) which means that the material of the strap and the glue connection have to be very strong, hence costly. Fourth, the strap can get caught when handling the package before lifting it by the strap, damaging the package before it reaches the customer.

For at least the above reasons, McElwee and Sutherland both fail to teach every limitation found in amended claim 1 as required to maintain a rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e) or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Further, since claims 2-7, 22 and 23 depend from claim 1, those claims are neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious by McElwee or Sutherland for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Regarding claim 8, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious by McElwee or Sutherland, alone or even if combined, for reasons analogous to those given above for claim 1. More specifically, McElwee and Sutherland both fail to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable first and second upper flaps "to be folded in inward directions about the fifth fold lines to collectively form an upper panel above that is substantially parallel with the bottom panel." Additionally, both McElwee and Sutherland also fail to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable that the first and second upper flaps include dimensions suitable to allow the first and second upper flaps to at least partially overlap each other over a region of the bottom panel that is to support the containers when placed within the package.

As explained above, both McElwee and Sutherland each utilize a single upper flap that extends entirely over containers to, by itself and without another overlapping upper flap, form the top of their respective packages. It follows that McElwee and Sutherland also fail to teach the claimed dimensions of the first upper flap and the non-existent second upper flap.

For at least the above reasons, McElwee and Sutherland both fail to teach every limitation found in amended claim 8 as required to maintain a rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e), or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Further, since claims 9-16 depend from claim 8, those claims are neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious by McElwee or Sutherland for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

New claims 25 and 26 requiring an aperture formed in each of the upper flaps that are aligned when the upper flaps are folded inward have been added by way of this amendment. McElwee and Sutherland also fail to teach every limitation found in these new claims as required to maintain a rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e), or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Neither McElwee or

Sutherland teach the aligned apertures formed in the top panel of the package that is substantially parallel with the bottom of the package as claimed.

The remaining claims in the present application are allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If any further fees are required by this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. VOB-38838.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By 
John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, OH 44114-3108
Phone: 216-579-1700

Date: 12-21-09